

“(C) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

“(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

“(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a description of participation rates, typical food packages, health and nutrition assessment procedures, eligibility determinations, management difficulties, and benefits of the program established under this section.

“(g) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to the Secretary of Defense to carry out this section—

“(A) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

“(B) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

“(C) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

“(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall be entitled to receive the funds and shall accept the funds, without further appropriation.”.

IMPORTED FOOD SAFETY ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to join with Senator COLLINS in introducing S. 1123, the Imported Food Safety Act of 1999. This legislation will address a growing problem that affects everyone in this nation, the safety of the food that we eat.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates as many as 9,100 deaths are attributed to foodborne illness each year in the United States. In addition there are tens of millions of cases of foodborne illness that occur, the majority of which go unreported due to the fact that they are not severe enough to warrant medical attention.

The legislation that Senator COLLINS and I have crafted will target one of the most critical areas in helping to provide Americans with the safest food possible—the safety of imported food. The CDC has recognized that as trade and economic development increases, the globalization of food supplies is likely to have an increasing impact on foodborne illnesses.

Currently, one-half of all the seafood and one-third of all the fresh fruit consumed in the U.S. comes from overseas. In fact, since the 1980's food imports to the U.S. have doubled, but federal inspections by Food and Drug Administration have dropped by 50 percent.

Over the years there have been foodborne pathogen outbreaks involving raspberries from Guatemala, strawberries from Mexico, scallions, parsley and cantaloupes from Mexico, carrots from Peru, coconut milk from Thailand, canned mushrooms from China and others. These outbreaks have serious consequences. The Mexican frozen strawberries I have just noted were distributed in the school lunch programs in several states, including my home state of Tennessee, were attributed to causing an outbreak of Hepatitis A in March of 1997.

The Collins-Frist bill will do several vital things to safeguard against potentially dangerous imported food. The bill would allow the U.S. Customs Service, using a system established by

FDA, to deny entry of imported food that has been associated with repeated and separate events of foodborne disease.

The bill would also allow the FDA to require food being imported by entities with a history of import violations to be held in a secure storage facility pending FDA approval and Customs release.

To improve the surveillance of imported food, we authorize CDC to enter into cooperative agreements and provide technical assistance to the States to conduct additional surveillance and studies to address critical questions for the prevention and control of foodborne diseases associated with imported food, and authorize CDC to conduct applied research to develop new or improved diagnostic tests for emerging foodborne pathogens in human specimens, food, and relevant environmental samples.

These are just a few of the many provisions in this bill that will help improve the quality and safety of the imported food that we consume every day. I applaud the leadership of my colleague, Senator COLLINS, who as Chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations held 4 comprehensive hearings last year on the issue of food safety. As Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Health, I look forward to working with Senator COLLINS and the rest of my colleagues on the issue of food safety and our overall efforts in improving our Nation's public health infrastructure. We must continue to fight infectious diseases and ensure that this legislation is enacted to help protect our citizens and provide them with the healthiest food possible.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to voice my support for S. 566, the Agricultural Trade Freedom Act, which was passed out of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry this morning on a 17-1 vote. I appreciate Senator LUGAR's strong leadership on these trade and international issues.

More than any other industry in America, agriculture is extremely dependent on international trade. In fact, almost one-third of our domestic agricultural production is sold outside of the United States. Clearly, a strong international market for agricultural commodities is therefore of utmost importance to our agriculture economy.

As those of us who herald from agricultural states know, the business of agriculture in America reaches far beyond farmers alone. There are many rural businesses, such as feed stores, machinery repair shops and veterinarians, who depend on a strong agricultural economy. And when we discuss international trade, there are many national businesses, such as agricultural exporters, which are greatly impacted by our trade policies.

Despite the importance of these international markets, agricultural commodities are occasionally eliminated from potential markets because of U.S. imposed unilateral economic sanctions against other countries. These economic sanctions are imposed for political, foreign policy reasons. Yet there is little to show that the inclusions of agricultural commodities in these sanctions actually have had the intended results. The question now emerging from this policy is who is actually hurt by the ban on exporting commercial agricultural commodities, and should it continue?

American farmers and exporters obviously face an immediate loss in trade when unilateral economic sanctions are imposed. Perhaps even more devastating, however, is the long-term loss of the market. Countries who need agricultural products do not wait for American sanctions to be lifted; they find alternative markets. This often leads to the permanent loss of a market for our agriculture industry, as new trading partnerships are established and maintained.

Our farmers, and the rural businesses and agriculture exporters associated with them, are consequently greatly hurt by this policy. The Agricultural Trade Freedom Act corrects this problem by exempting commercial agricultural products from U.S. unilateral economic sanctions. The exemption of commercial agricultural products is not absolute; the President can make the determination that these items are indeed a necessary part of the sanction for achieving the intended foreign policy goal. In this situation, the President would be required to report to Congress regarding the purposes of the sanctions and their likely economic impacts.

Recently, the administration lifted restrictions on the sale of food to Sudan, Iran and Libya—all countries whose governments we have serious disagreements with. It did so, and I am among those who supported that decision, because food, like medicines, should not be used as a tool of foreign policy. It is also self-defeating. While our farmers lost sales, foreign farmers made profits.

Unfortunately, the administration did not see fit to apply the same reasoning to Cuba. American farmers cannot sell food to Cuba, even though it is only 90 miles from our shores and there is a significant potential market there. This contradiction is beneath a great and powerful country, and Senator LUGAR's legislation would permit such sales. The administration should pay more attention to what is in our national interests, rather than to a tiny, vocal minority who are wedded to a policy that has hurt American farmers and the Cuban people.

The Agricultural Trade Freedom Act maintains the President's need for flexibility in foreign policy while simultaneously recognizing the impact that sanctions may have on the agricultural economy. This legislation is